



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/577,237 | 02/22/2007 | Jyunichi Samo | 0666.2870000/TGD/JHH | 4121 |
| 26111 7590 08/15/2008 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | | |
| EXAMINER COLEMAN, KEITH A | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 3747 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 08/15/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/577,237

Applicant(s)

SAMO ET AL.

Examiner

KEITH COLEMAN

Art Unit

3747

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KEITH COLEMAN.(3) John Haran.(2) Steve Cronin.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 24 July 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Skinner (US Patent No. 4,355,609).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant wanted clarification on the rejections involving the different lever mechanisms shown by Skinner, particularly labels such as which lever was the first, second, and third lever. In addition, Applicant argued that the stop member 19 was not attached as shown in Figure 1. In the end, SPE and Examiner believed a new action should be sent further clarifying the complexities of the Skinner and Sakaguchi et al.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Stephen K. Cronin/
SPE, AU 3747

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required